REMARKS

Initially, notes that the remarks and amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed with the Examiner during the telephonic interview of August 7, 2007.

By this paper, claims 24, 26, and 29-32 have been amended and no claims have been added or canceled such that claims 24-32 and 34 remain pending. Of the pending claims, 24 and 34 are the only independent claims at issue.¹

The Final Office Action mailed July 16, 2007, considered and rejected claims 24-32 and 34. Claims 24, 25, 27-32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett (U.S. Patent 6,772,157), hereinafter Barnett, in view of DeKoning (U.S. Patent 6,671,776), hereinafter DeKoning. Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett in view of DeKoning, further in view of Anglin (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0199521). ²

The current invention is directed to embodiments for delegating administrative rights to a zone based security system. Claim 24, for example, recites a method in a computer system wherein the computer system includes items stored in at least one volume, the volume being divided into at least one non-overlapping security zone, a security zone being defined as a grouping of items having common security rules. The method identifies first items and other items residing in a main non-overlapping security zone within a volume comprising a plurality of non-overlapping security zones. The main security zone is split into a first non-overlapping security zone and a remaining non-overlapping main security zone such that the first non-overlapping security zone and the remaining non-overlapping main security zones do not overlap with any of the plurality of other non-overlapping security zones included in the volume. The one or more main principals retain administrative rights for the first non-overlapping security zone and the remaining main non-overlapping security zone with the first non-overlapping security zone including the first items and the remaining main non-overlapping security zone included in the

¹ Support for the amendments is found throughout the Specification and more particularly on page 5 of the Application as originally filed.

Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

first items. The splitting is restricted in such a way as to prevent overlapping between security zones and such that none of the first items and other items from the main non-overlapping security zone are shared when the main non-overlapping security zone is split. The security zones thereby have a dynamic configurable granularity of items having common security rules. One or more first principals are then specified that also have administrative rights to the first non-overlapping security zone containing the first items.

The remaining independent claim, claim 34, is a computer program product that contains the limitation of impendent claim 24 described above and the discussion related to claim 24 is applicable to independent claim 34 as well.

The Office Action cited Barnett as teaching the delegation of administrative rights to sub administrators in a method corresponding to claim 24. However, as discussed over the phone, Barnett fails to teach or disclose domains that are non-overlapping. In Barnett, each of the users belongs to multiple combinations of domains and sub-domains rather than to a single security zone. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that Barnett fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations present in the claims.

To demonstrate the limitation of non-overlapping zones, the Office Action cites DeKoning. DeKoning teaches a network storage array wherein the array is divided into volumes that different hosts can access. DeKoning discloses that the administrator is allowed to define the partitions of storage such that each volume is accessible only to the hosts that the administrator has enabled. However, as discussed over the phone, DeKoning fails to teach that the security zones have a dynamic configurable granularity as claimed. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teachings of Barnett and DeKoning fail to disclose all of the limitation present in the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any

Application No. 10/630,162 Amendment "B" dated October 16, 2007 Reply to Final Office Action mailed July 16, 2007

Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 16th day of October, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER

Registration No. 28,651

JENS C. JENKINS

Registration No. 44,803

JOHN C. BACOCH

Registration No. 59,890

Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 47973

JCJ:ahy AHY0000006343V001